



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/942,330	08/29/2001	Michael Williams	1003-0607	7713

7590

05/10/2006

Peter P. Scott
c/o Connie Del Castillo
LSI Logic Corporation
1551 McCarthy Boulevard, M/S D-106
Milpitas, CA 95035

EXAMINER

ZERVIGON, RUDY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1763

DATE MAILED: 05/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/942,330	Applicant(s) WILLIAMS ET AL.	
	Examiner Rudy Zervigon	Art Unit 1763	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 21-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 25 and 26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 21-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on May 8, 2006, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:


PARVIZ HASSANZADEH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claims 1, 2, 8, 10, 22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alan Notman (USPat. 4,311,671) in view of Posa; John G. (US 4,747,367 A). Alan Notman teaches a catalytic gas reactor (Figure 1; column 6, line 59 – column 7, line 31) including:

Art Unit: 1763

- i. An enclosure (10) which defines an interior void (Figure 1) and a longitudinal axis down the center of item 42
- ii. A first partition (16A; column 6, lines 59-68) having a first orifice ("central hole"; column 2, lines 1-15; column 7, lines 3-7) defined therein, the first partition being positioned within the interior void such that:
 - a. The first partition divides the interior void into a first chamber (12A) and a second chamber (12B) and
 - b. The first orifice is in fluid communication with the first chamber and the second chamber (Figure 1; column 7, lines 3-7)
- iii. A gas connector (conduit 34) which has:
 - a. A passageway (34) defined there through and
 - b. A gas port (30) in fluid communication with the passageway and supplied by a gas source (see arrow entering 30; column 7, lines 1-10), the passageway having an inlet (34) and an outlet (32) and being in direct fluid communication with the first chamber (12A) of the enclosure
 - c. The gas source is advanced into the passageway (34) of the gas connector (conduit 34) via conduit 26
 - d. The gas port (30) being downstream of the gas connector inlet (34) and downstream of the gas connector outlet (32)
- iv. A gas dispenser (28A/B) in direct fluid communication with the second chamber (12B) of the enclosure; and
- v. An exit port (50) in fluid communication with the interior

Art Unit: 1763

- vi. A second partition (16B) having a second orifice (holes in 16B, not labeled, see crossing arrows indicating flow) therein wherein
- a. The second partition is positioned within the second chamber (12B)
 - b. The first orifice has a first central axis (collinear to central axis of 42) and being aligned (colinear) with the longitudinal axis of the enclosure, the first central axis is further unobstructed such that gas can pass (see flow arrows) from the first chamber to the second chamber through the first central axis
 - c. The second orifice (holes in 16B other than 42, not labeled, see crossing arrows indicating flow) has a second central axis and the second central axis of the second orifice is offset (see Figure 1) relative to the first central axis of the first orifice

Alan Notman further teaches water vapor gas source ("boiler"; column 6, lines 32-35; column 4, lines 55-60; Table 1 - column 10, lines 40-60). Further, it is well established that in apparatus claims it is inherent that Alan Notman's gas processing apparatus can process water vapor gas. It is well established that apparatus claims must be structurally distinguished from the prior art (In re Danley, 120 USPQ 528, 531 (CCPA 1959). "Apparatus claims cover what a device is, not what a device does ." (emphasis in original) Hewlett - Packard Co . v. Bausch & Lomb Inc ., 15 USPQ2d 1525, 1528 (Fed. Cir. 1990), MPEP – 2114)

Alan Notman does not teach that his gas port (30) is upstream of the gas connector outlet (32).

Posa teaches a gas mixing manifold assembly (222; Figure 3; column 7, lines 20-56) including a gas connector (222; Figure 3) with plural gas ports (outlets from valves 210,212; Figure 3;

Art Unit: 1763

106/108; Figure 4) located upstream of the gas connector (222; Figure 3) outlet (222/216 interface; Figure 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace Alan Notman's gas connector (conduit 34) with Posa's gas connector (222; Figure 3).

Motivation to replace Alan Notman's gas connector (conduit 34) with Posa's gas connector (222; Figure 3) is for adding plural reactive gas source inlets as taught by Posa (column 5; lines 58-67). Further, it is well established that the duplication of parts is obvious (In re Harza, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960) MPEP 2144.04).

4. Claims 3-6, 21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alan Notman (USPat. 4,311,671) in view of Posa; John G. (US 4,747,367 A). Alan Notman and Posa are discussed above. Alan Notman further teaches points on Alan Notman's partitions (16A,B,C) that are collinear with the chamber's longitudinal axis (Figure 1). Alan Notman further teaches adjacent partitions (16A/B; 16B/C) such that each partition forms corresponding sub-chambers by interposing the corresponding partitions (Figure 1). Alan Notman further teaches partition orifice that are in direct fluid communication (see arrows in Figure 1) with the first chamber and the corresponding sub-chamber. Alan Notman further teaches an end wall (22c, Figure 1).

Alan Notman further teaches plural orifice (holes in 16A,B,C; not labeled, see crossing arrows indicating flow) with corresponding central axis where each orifice's central axis is offset relative to the central axis of each other orifice. Alan Notman further teaches a longitudinal axis, as above, that divides the enclosure into a first and second half (Figure 1) where orifice of each partition are either located in the first or second half of the partition.

Art Unit: 1763

Alan Notman does not teach partitions, in Figure 1, beyond 3. As a result, Alan Notman does not teach fourth, fifth, and sixth partitions resulting in corresponding fourth, fifth, and sixth sub-chambers.

Alan Notman does not teach that his first and second orifice comprise the largest orifice in his first and second partitions respectively such that the central axis of the first and second orifice are offset relative to each other.

Alan Notman does not teach his gas port disposed between the inlet and outlet of his passageway.

Posa teaches a gas mixing manifold assembly (222; Figure 3; column 7, lines 20-56) including a gas connector (222; Figure 3) with plural gas ports (outlets from valves 210,212; Figure 3; 106/108; Figure 4) located upstream of the gas connector (222; Figure 3) outlet (222/216 interface; Figure 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

- a. replace Alan Notman's gas connector (conduit 34) with Posa's gas connector (222; Figure 3)
- b. to duplicate Alan Notman's partitions thereby adding additional partitions to Alan Notman's catalytic gas reactor resulting in corresponding fourth, fifth, and sixth sub-chambers
- c. to optimize the dimension of Notman's orifice in each of the first and second partitions such that the largest orifice of each partition produce axis that are offset relative to each other

Art Unit: 1763

Motivation to replace Alan Notman's gas connector (conduit 34) with Posa's gas connector (222; Figure 3) is for adding plural reactive gas source inlets as taught by Posa (column 5; lines 58-67). Motivation to duplicate Alan Notman's partitions thereby adding additional partitions to Alan Notman's catalytic gas reactor resulting in corresponding fourth, fifth, and sixth sub-chambers, and to optimize the dimension of Notman's orifice in each of the first and second partitions such that the largest orifice of each partition produce axis that are offset relative to each other, and to optimize the dimension (height) of Notman's gas connector passageway such that his gas port disposed between the inlet and outlet of his passageway is to provide for longer residence time for the flowing gasses (column 3, lines 7-8; column 4, lines 12-17). Further, it is well established that the duplication of parts is obvious (*In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960) MPEP 2144.04). Further, It is well established that changes in apparatus dimensions are within the level of ordinary skill in the art. (*Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc.*, 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984); *In re Rose*, 220 F.2d 459, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955); *In re Rinehart*, 531 F.2d 1048, 189 USPQ 143 (CCPA 1976); See MPEP 2144.04).

5. Claims 7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mundt (USPat. 5,137,701) in view of Alan Notman (USPat. 4,311,671) and Posa; John G. (US 4,747,367 A). Mundt teaches an etch apparatus (12, Figure 1; column 1, lines 22-34) which generates an etch gas product (down stream of item 12), where the etch gas apparatus being in fluid communication with an enclosure (Figure 3) defining the process effluent abatement arrangement (18, 32, 16, 20, 36; Figure 1; column 5, lines 13-38).

Art Unit: 1763

Alan Notman and Posa are discussed above. However, Alan Notman and Posa do not teach an etch apparatus which generates an etch gas product, where the etch gas apparatus being in fluid communication with the gas connector such that the etch gas product generated by the etch apparatus is advanced into the interior void of the enclosure defining the process effluent abatement arrangement.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace Mundt's process effluent abatement arrangement with Alan Notman's catalytic gas reactor to process the effluent from Mundt's etch apparatus.

Motivation to replace Mundt's process effluent abatement arrangement with Alan Notman's catalytic gas reactor to process the effluent from Mundt's etch apparatus is to reduce the hazardous process chemicals from the etch reactor as taught by Mundt (column 1, lines 22-33).

6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alan Notman (USPat. 4,311,671) and Posa; John G. (US 4,747,367 A) in view of Thomas G. McGinness. (USPat. 5,384,051). Alan Notman and Posa are discussed above. Alan Notman further teaches heating elements (60,62) as heat exchangers that are in thermal communication with the gas provided by the gas source at exchanger 62. As a result, Alan Notman does not teach an electrical heating element that is in thermal communication with the gas provided by the gas source. Thomas G. McGinness teaches an electrical heating element (32, Figure 1; column 8, lines 55-62) that is in thermal communication with the gas ("carrier fluid/oxidizer mixture") provided by the gas source.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace Alan Notman's heating element with McGinness' electrical heating element.

Art Unit: 1763

Motivation to replace Alan Notman's heating element with McGinness' electrical heating element is to provide an alternate and equivalent means for heating.

7. Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mundt (USPat. 5,137,701) and Posa; John G. (US 4,747,367 A) in view of Alan Notman (USPat. 4,311,671) and Thomas G. McGinness. (USPat. 5,384,051). Alan Notman, Posa, and Mundt are discussed above. Alan Notman further teaches heating elements (60,62) as heat exchangers that are in thermal communication with the gas provided by the gas source at exchanger 62. As a result, Alan Notman does not teach an electrical heating element that is in thermal communication with the gas provided by the gas source. Thomas G. McGinness teaches an electrical heating element (32, Figure 1; column 8, lines 55-62) that is in thermal communication with the gas ("carrier fluid/oxidizer mixture") provided by the gas source.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add McGinness' heating element to be in thermal communication with the gas provided by the gas source of Alan Notman and Mundt, and to replace Mundt's process effluent abatement arrangement with Alan Notman's catalytic gas reactor to process the effluent from Mundt's etch apparatus.

Motivation to add McGinness' heating element to be in thermal communication with the gas provided by the gas source of Alan Notman is to control the temperature of the gas provided by the gas source of Alan Notman and Mundt.

Motivation to replace Mundt's process effluent abatement arrangement with Alan Notman's catalytic gas reactor to process the effluent from Mundt's etch apparatus is to reduce the hazardous process chemicals from the etch reactor as taught by Mundt (column 1, lines 22-33).

Art Unit: 1763

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14, and 21-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Rudy Zervigon whose telephone number is (571) 272-1442. The examiner can normally be reached on a Monday through Thursday schedule from 8am through 7pm. The official fax phone number for the 1763 art unit is (571) 273-8300. Any Inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Chemical and Materials Engineering art unit receptionist at (571) 272-1700. If the examiner can not be reached please contact the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh, at (571) 272-1435.

Rudy Zervigon
5/8/6